

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-38, and 40-63 are now pending in this application. The non-final Office Action mailed April 4, 2005 rejected claims 1-3, 5-38, and 40-53. Claims 1, 3, 5, 15, 18, 48, 50, and 51 have been amended in this response. New Claims 54-63 are added. No claims have been canceled. No new matter has been added. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the art of record and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

**Claim Objections**

The Office Action objected to Claims 1, 48, 50, and 51 because of an informality, in that the phrase “sentence **in** entered” should be changed to “sentence **is** entered.” Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for this observation. Each of these limitations has been ‘moved’ to dependent claims with the informality corrected. See new Claims 55-59.

**Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejected claims 5-16, 19-30, 37, 48, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,021,412 issued to Ho et al. (hereafter “Ho”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,674 to Murakami et al. (hereafter “Murakami”). Claims 1-3, 18, 31-36, 38, 40-47, 49, 51-43 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ho and Murakami as applied to claims 103, 5-16, 19-30, 37, 39, 48, and 50, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,677 to Balogh et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of the claims as currently amended. For example, as amended, claim 1 recites a method for searching a database to obtain an object that is related to an indicated object in a document. The method of claim 1 further recites, among other things, automatically creating a query...and if a remote search engine is accessible providing the query over a network to the remote search engine to search a remote database for an image that is related to the indicated text, and if the remote search engine is inaccessible providing the query to a local search engine to search a local database for an

image that is related to the indicated text. This limitation is clearly supported by the Applicants' specification and figures at page 14, lines 14- 25.

Unlike the Applicants' invention, however, Ho does not disclose or suggest use of a plurality of search engines that includes a remote search engine and a local search engine, where the remote search engine searches a remote database and the local search engine searches a local database. Instead, Ho merely describes a single graphics library that is on the same computer system 100 as the graphics presentation program. See Ho, Col. 4, lines 3-20. There is no suggestion even of an access to a remote search engine or a remote database. Thus, Ho does not describe remote access over a network to the database or to the search engine. Moreover, Murakami also does not disclose or suggest use of a database or search engine that are accessed remotely over a network. Instead, Murakami describes an image output device with the image data being locally accessed on the image output device. See Murakami, Figure 6, and Col. 5, lines 30-57.

Furthermore, while Balogh teaches using a network to communicate with a search engine, Balogh does not discuss determining if the remote search engine is accessible, and if it is inaccessible, searching a separate local database using a local search engine. In fact, neither Ho, Marukami, nor Balogh teaches making a determination to select from one of a remote search engine and a local search engine based on the availability of the remote search engine. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

In addition, because amended independent Claims 5, 48, 50, and 51 include similar limitations as Claim 1, albeit different, they are also allowable for at least substantially the same reasons as independent Claim 1.

In regard to dependent Claim 24, the Office Action argues that Ho and Murakami teach "a navigation component [that] enables the **display of a group of related images in a slide show**, the group of related images being indicated in the result from the query." See Claim 24 of Applicants. The Office Action points to figures 10-11 of Ho in its argument as evidence of such

teachings. However, the Applicants respectfully disagree. What Ho illustrates in figures 10-11 is a display of a group, where each of the images is displayed in **other than a slide show**.

Unlike the Applicants' invention, neither Ho nor Murakami disclose or suggest a **slide show** as claimed in Claim 24. The slide show, as described in the Applicants' specification and as illustrated in one embodiment, provides is arranged to graphically illustrate the progressive display of each thumbnail image. See Applicants' specification at page 9, lines 16-17; and figures 2-3. That is, the Applicants' slide show illustrates a single image at a time from the group of images. This is unlike the cited references that illustrate all the images at the same time, which is clearly not in a slide show fashion. Thus, as claimed by the Applicants, neither Ho nor Murakami employs, teaches, or suggests the display of a group of related images **in a slide show**. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render Claim 24 obvious. Because new Claim 54 recites a similar limitation, it is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 24.

In regard to Claims 2-3 and 54; 6-38, 40-47; 49; and 52-53 which are dependent on amended independent Claims 1, 5, 48, and 51, respectively, they are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above for those independent claims.

With respect to new Claims 55-59, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of the claims as currently amended. For example, claim 55, which depends from claim 1, recites that selecting the nearest word further comprises: enabling a sentence comprising a plurality of words to be input into the document, repositioning a cursor nearest to any one of the words in the sentence other than a last word input into the document, wherein the cursor is capable of being repositioned nearest to any one of the words after the sentence is entered into the document, and after repositioning the cursor, selecting the nearest word to the cursor in the sentence as the indicated object without having a user make a selection for the query in a separate document.



**CONCLUSION**

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: July 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jamie L. Wiegand

Registration No.: 52,361

DARBY &amp; DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No.: 39179